

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated February 3, 2009, the Examiner: (a) objects to Claim 13 because an "arraignment" is excessive at this point in the prosecution; (b) objects to Claim 5 because it refers to respective magnets in plural yet the plurality of each type of magnet is introduced in Claim 2; (c) rejects Claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kondo et al. (US 6,897,370); (d) rejects Claims 2, 3, 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. in view of Fritsch et al. (5,829,987); (e) rejects Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. and Fritsch et al. in view of Harbauer (US 4,318,065); (f) rejects Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al.

By this response, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 9, and cancelled Claims 2, 3, 4, and 13.

The Examiner objected to Claim 13 because an "arraignment" is excessive at this point in the prosecution. While Applicant appreciates Examiner's humor, Claim 13 has been cancelled, and as such, the rejection is moot.

The Examiner objected to Claim 5 because it refers to respective magnets in plural yet the plurality of each type of magnet is introduced in Claim 2. Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of Claim 2 which introduces the plurality of each type of magnet. Claim 5 depends ultimately, on Claim 1 and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 discussed below.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kondo et al. (US 6,897,370). Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include the subject matter of

Claims 2, 3 and 4. As amended, Claim 1 requires that one of the connection piece and the connection terminal has a plurality of only permanent magnets disposed symmetrically around an electrical contact piece, and the other of the connection terminal and the connection piece has a plurality of only electromagnets disposed symmetrically around an electrical contact piece. The plurality of permanent magnets in the one of the connection piece and connection terminal are associated with the plurality of electromagnets in the other of the connection piece and connection terminal. Further, amended Claim 1 requires that the contact faces of each contact piece bear against each other to make electrically conductive contact with each other when in the plurality of permanent magnets and electromagnets are attracted to each other. Kondo does not disclose such an arrangement. Kondo teaches a relatively flat coupler 41 and plug 42 with multiple sets of contacts being positioned outside a centrally located magnet set. Arranging a plurality of permanent magnets and electromagnets symmetrically around single electrical contact pieces as claimed in the subject invention is opposite in purpose than that taught by Kondo. Arranging a plurality of permanent magnets and electromagnets symmetrically around single electrical contact pieces is not possible without significant restructuring and reimagining of the Kondo connection. Further, Kondo uses V-shaped inlets to the plug 42 for alignment of the electrical contacts, not needing or contemplating using the magnets for alignment purposes as implied by the Examiner. Kondo fails to disclose the arrangement of amended Claim 1, and as such, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are overcome.

The Examiner rejected Claims 2, 3, 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. in view of Fritsch et al. (5,829,987). Applicant has amended Claim 1 to

include the subject matter of Claims 2 and 3. Fritsch et al. does not make up for the deficient teachings of Kondo et al. Fritsch teaches the use of permanent magnets being disposed in both the connection terminal and the connection piece. Fritsch fails to disclose, teach or suggest the use of a permanent magnet disposed in one of the connection terminal or the connection piece and being associated with the electromagnetic disposed in the other of the connection terminal and connection piece to repel or attract the connection terminal and the connection piece. Applicant has cancelled Claims 2 and 3, and as such, the rejection is moot. Claims 7-9 depend ultimately, on Claim 1 and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. The dependent claims distinguish over their parent and one another by reciting applicant's invention in greater detail. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are overcome.

The Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. and Fritsch et al. in view of Harbauer (US 4,318,065). Claim 10 depends ultimately, on Claim 1 and is believed allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 discussed above. Fritsch and Harbauer do not make up for the deficient teachings of Kondo as discussed above. It is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion for one skilled in the art to combine Kondo, Fritsch and Harbauer. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are overcome.

The Examiner rejected Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kondo et al. Claim 13 has been cancelled and as such, the rejection is moot.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant has responded in a fully satisfactory manner to all matters at issue in this Application, and that this Application is now in condition for allowance. In this regard, Applicant has made every effort to comply with the requirements set forth in the Final Office Action as well as the statutory requirements. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow the pending claims and pass the Application to issue, or in the alternative, issue an Advisory Action. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 433-7200.


The Patent Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to Deposit Account No. 04-1061 in the name of Dickinson Wright PLLC.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dickinson Wright PLLC
Attorneys for Applicant

Date: April 2, 2009

By: 
Richard A. Jones
Reg. No. 39,242

Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington 20006
(248) 433-7285

BLOOMFIELD 27181-63 970025v3